



**STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS
FOR THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY
SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT BOUNDARY REVIEW
COMMITTEE
KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 381B
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012**

Wednesday, June 29, 2011

2:00 PM

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Pedersen, Vice Chair Holoman, Commissioner Reyes, Commissioner Martinez, Commissioner Ollague, Commissioner Choi, Commissioner Escandon, Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Acebo, Commissioner Hatanaka, Commissioner Napolitano, Commissioner Hernandez, Commissioner Hoffenblum and Commissioner Mejia

Excused: Commissioner Andrade, Commissioner Friedman, Commissioner Flores, Commissioner Hollister, Commissioner Sun and Commissioner Tse

1. Call to order and introduction by Chair Pedersen. (11-3055)

The meeting was called to order by Chair Pedersen at 2:11 p.m.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER

2. Approval of Minutes of June 22, 2011. (11-2977)

On motion of Commissioner Hoffenblum, seconded by Commissioner Reyes, this item was approved.

Attachments: [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Minutes](#)

II. REPORTS

3. Report on redistricting website activity. (11-3056)

Susan Herman of the Chief Executive Office reported that since the June 22, 2011 Boundary Review Committee (BRC) meeting, there have been approximately 4,000 additional hits to the redistricting website, bringing the total number of hits to 22,751. The busiest day thus far has been June 23, 2011 with the “submitted plans” being the most popular page followed by “comments and letters submitted.”

Commissioner Hoffenblum indicated that he had difficulty locating Commissioners' biographies on the redistricting website.

Ms. Herman directed Commissioner Hoffenblum to the Commissioners' biographies section of the redistricting website.

Martin Zimmerman of the Chief Executive Office stated the Commissioners' Biographies section will be included in the drop down menu under the Boundary Review Committee tab of the redistricting website for easier access.

4. Consideration of additional redistricting data. (11-3057)

No Staff Report was presented.

Alan Clayton, a member of the public, addressed the Committee regarding his continued request to include two non-incumbent elections which occurred in 2006. The first was a Democratic Primary election for California Attorney General that featured Jerry Brown versus Rocky Delgadillo. The second election was the Democratic Primary for California Secretary of State between Debra Ortiz and Debra Bowen. Mr. Clayton indicated he was bewildered as to why these two elections have not yet been included. Mr. Clayton believes these two elections are relevant and would be very useful to the community, BRC members and the Board of Supervisors who will ultimately approve a redistricting plan. However, Mr. Clayton is pleased and thankful that the "poverty layer" was included.

Commissioner Hoffenblum inquired as to why these two elections have not yet been included.

Mr. Zimmerman indicated that it is up to the Committee to decide if it wishes to include this data in analyzing plans going forward.

Frank Cheng of the Chief Executive Office stated that the time for staff to prepare the two elections in question for the database would not be significant. However, including the two elections in the redistricting software would take approximately 10 days according to the software vendor.

Commissioner Harris inquired if the redistricting software includes any primary election, including mayoral primary election, data for the City of Los Angeles. He was advised that several such elections are included based on the Committee's prior direction.

Commissioner Harris also asked Mr. Clayton what he believes will be revealed if the two referenced elections were included.

Mr. Clayton stated the Committee voted in the past to include the California Attorney General election between Kamala Harris and Steve Cooley. The two 2006 elections would show how a prominent minority candidate fared in each district against a prominent non-minority candidate. In addition, it will reveal how people voted across the five districts.

After discussion, the Committee voted to ask staff to prepare both primary and general election data from the 2006 election for California Attorney General and California Secretary of State.

- 5. Consideration of redistricting plans submitted by the public, including discussion of potential revisions by Committee members:**

Plan Q1, submitted by Steven Ochoa (Mexican American Legal Defense Fund).
Plan R1, submitted by Steven Ochoa (Mexican American Legal Defense Fund).
Plan S1, submitted by Jackie Dupont-Walker, Tunua Thrash, Marqueece Harris-Dawson (Community Coalition, West Los Angeles CDC, Ward AME EDC District 5).

Plan A1 (Benchmark Plan) is also included for reference

Note: Plans not discussed at scheduled meeting due to time constraints will be carried over to the next Boundary Review Committee meeting. (11-3058)

Proposed Plan S1 submitted by submitted by Jackie Dupont-Walker, Tunua Thrash, Marqueece Harris-Dawson (Community Coalition, West Los Angeles CDC, Ward AME EDC District 5):

Martin Zimmerman provided his report, noting this plan did not use the County Redistricting software or Redistricting Units (RDUs). All analyses included were performed using RDUs. Thus, reports presented are approximations only (page 12).

1. Proposes reassignment of 1,003 redistricting units which make up 129 whole or partial communities (pages 6-8 of the staff report).
2. Total population deviation is 0.57% (page 26).
3. The total number of people moved from one district to another is 3,350,488 (page 13).
4. Deferred and Advanced Voting – The County Counsel report indicates that, countywide 21.9% of constituents would have the frequency of their voting deferred or advanced under this proposed plan.
5. Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) by District:

Race/Ethnicity Categories
(Page 39 of staff report, page 23 of Benchmark)

Hispanic Plan S1		Benchmark
District 1	53.2 %	63.3 %
District 2	34.9 %	33.6 %
District 3	14.2 %	23.8 %
District 4	52.0 %	31.6 %
District 5	23.3 %	24.7 %

African American Plan S1		Benchmark
District 1	4.8 %	3.6 %
District 2	36.2 %	36.5 %
District 3	6.1 %	5.0 %
District 4	6.1 %	7.8 %
District 5	6.8 %	6.8 %

Asian Plan S1		Benchmark
District 1	12.1 %	18.2 %
District 2	10.3 %	10.5 %
District 3	12.0 %	10.3 %
District 4	17.6 %	16.9 %
District 5	19.3 %	16.5 %

Party Affiliation by District (page 34 of staff report, page 18 of Benchmark). Mr. Zimmerman stated the percentages for party affiliation were mostly very similar between Plan S1 and the Benchmark, and highlighted the following Party Affiliation in District 3 which varies somewhat more than for other districts:

Democratic Plan S1	Benchmark
47.8 %	52.9 %
Republican Plan S1	Benchmark
25.4 %	19.7%

6. This plan does not appear to displace any Supervisor from his/her district.
7. The districts appear to be contiguous and reasonably compact.
8. This plan proposes the following City/Community Splits: Azusa*, Covina, El Monte, Glendora, La Verne, Long Beach, and Monterey Park (further detailed in the staff report and County Counsel report).
 - * Previously split but plan splits it in a new way.

Commissioner Ollague questioned how many people in Azusa were moved because it did not seem as if Azusa was split and it appears on the map to be unified. Frank Cheng of the Chief Executive Office will research the data.

9. This plan would unify three cities (Hawthorne, Pico Rivera, and West Covina) as well as communities within the City of Los Angeles and unincorporated communities.
10. Highlights of Major facilities moved from their current districts are as follows (complete list is detailed in the County Counsel report pages 5-8):
 - Brackett Field – from District 5 to 4
 - Whiteman Airport – from District 3 to 1
 - South Coast Botanic Garden – from District 4 to 3
 - Downey/Rancho Complex – from District 4 to 1
 - Van Nuys Civic Center – from District 3 to 1
 - Edmund Edelman Children's Court – from District 1 to 5
 - Fairplex – from District 1 to 4
 - John Anson Ford Theater – from District 3 to 1
 - Santa Catalina Island Facilities – from District 4 to 3
 - Whittier Narrows Regional Recreation Area – from District 1 to 4

Marqueece Harris-Dawson addressed the Committee and stated the following:

- I am President and CEO of Community Coalition, which is a community-based civil rights organization in South Los Angeles. We represent most of what is now the 2nd Supervisory District and beyond that. My partners include Jackie Dupont-Walker, President of the Ward Economic Development Corporation, AME District 5 and the Chair of USC Master Plan Advisory Commission. She also served on the City of Los Angeles' Redistricting Commission in 2001.

- Tunua Thrash is the Executive Director of West Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation and previously served on the Community Advisory Committee with Greenlighting Institute on Redistricting. We are all members of the African American Redistricting Collaborative (AARC) and have been submitting maps as well as monitoring and participating in testimony before the California Redistricting Commission (CRC). We have played an educational and outreach role in the community and have been able to acquire mapping expertise as well as voting rights expertise in order to inform our submissions to various bodies including this one.
- As you may recall, the AARC submitted State maps to the CRC, and Ms. Walker, along with the AME Church, submitted maps as well. On the State level, we have had partners such as MALDEF and others. A good demonstration of this partnership today was shown by Steven Ochoa, and I thank him for letting me address the Committee first so that I can leave for my next meeting.
- For this map, we used input from a number of civil rights, faith-based, and community-based organizations, as well as business leaders in our community and members of the organized labor movement. One of the things about South Los Angeles in particular is the strength of the faith-based community there, the strength of the business community and the density of the folks that are involved in the labor movement.
- We are presenting a map that was drawn using similar architecture to what we did at the statewide level. We have learned about communities of interest through testimony and the hearing held in LA this past May and one this past week in Culver City. We too were swamped with CRC related work at the time of your initial deadline and thank you for your extension.
- Our map was drawn in Maptitude, a GIS platform similar to ESRI, due to our familiarity with the Maptitude program. It was the most viable solution for submitting under your timeframe. It also allowed us to use neighborhood council boundaries, limit our number of city splits and overlay additional data sets so that the community can interact with it. People should also know there is a center that the State provided near USC where community members can go and use Maptitude and we get a lot of feedback.
- I would like to talk about a few highlights from the summary provided by staff. In addition to meeting the criteria of being contiguous and compact, the total population deviation of this plan is 0.57%. It doesn't displace any supervisors as the staff report pointed out, and it also keeps the majority of neighborhoods whole and unites many which were previously divided; if you would like a list, we will send that to you electronically.

- We have some discrepancy with the amount of city splits that the staff reported. We think that something might have happened with the translation from the software we used to the software you used. Your report indicates 34 splits, and we are down somewhere around 10, but we can submit this in writing.
- The community of interest data, which we used to draw our State submission and our County submission, was the primary driver for our proposed boundaries in the South L.A. community, which is where our organizations are all located. But we also listened to communities in other parts of Los Angeles County and that informed what we did. Additionally, we worked to keep the coastal environmental community united as well as both ports in a single district. We also wanted to respect both Valleys keeping the San Fernando Valley and the San Gabriel Valley each in a single district and the gateway cities in only two districts.
- It is our deeply held belief that the community should have the opportunity to elect a candidate of choice. After all, that is part of American history, a tradition of our political life, and very near and dear to our community in South Los Angeles where we have the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), The Urban League and many of the community organizations that brought the Voting Acts Right to the American legal system and our system of redistricting.
- We hope that you will respect the Voting Rights Act (VRA) and more specifically Section 2; The Voting Rights Act was a landmark piece of national civil rights legislation that outlawed discriminatory voting practices and disenfranchisement. This Act protects voters from practices that deprive them of their vote on the basis of race, color or membership of a language minority group. More specifically, Section 2 highlights the majority minority district where a racial or language minority comprised at least 50% or more voter eligible population. This remains a high priority for all Angelinos.
- Certainly we understand the fine balance between voting rights protections for minority voting rights and the constitutional rule that districts can't be drawn primarily on the basis of race, and we are here to assure you that the plan was not drawn with race as a predominant consideration. Our plan was drawn with communities and their communities of interest as a predominant consideration. By allowing input from the community in drawing the maps as we've done, we feel confident that we are representing the interest of our residents.

- Lastly, I'd like to review what we think are a few strengths of our plan in District 1. We keep the San Fernando Valley whole, East LA is kept whole, and Downtown Los Angeles remains in a single district. Population equality is met and packing and cracking are not issues in spite of significant growth in the Latino population in existing District 1.
- To be clear, we drew on the basis of communities of interest and what we found and identified when using the 2010 Census figures. We found that that two Voting Rights Act Section 2, Latino opportunity districts exist in LA County. Similar to others who have presented or will present, we found these opportunities as part of our process in drawing the districts, not with the intent of drawing on the basis of race and this you'll see in the numbers. In District 1, Latino Citizen Voting Age Population is 53.2% and in District 4 it is 52%. Both districts contain defensible communities of interest, all of which were identified during the State process. If requested, we can help gather some of that testimony and forward it to you.
- In terms of District 2, it is similar to the Assembly and Senate maps that we submitted to the State in the Northridge hearing in late May, using existing Assembly numbers, District 2 encompasses 8047, 8048, 8051, and 8052 it extends slightly further south to meet population requirements and includes Wilmington. The primary difference to the existing District is the shift of Lynwood from District 2 into District 4. As you may know Lynwood is socially and economically similar to the southeast and it happens that all the City Council members serving are Latino, and therefore, more closely identified socially economically with their neighbors in Bellflower and Downey, both culturally and in terms of language needs.
- Coastal and beach communities of interest were the foundations of drawing District 3 along the coast where we all know residents near the ports face similar environmental challenges and issues such as air quality and noise pollution. Additionally, workers from the port and their working families tend to live in nearby neighborhoods and closely connect their residence to their work locations. Also, at the CRC's Long Beach meeting, testimony overwhelmingly favored drawing coastal seats at both the Assembly and Congressional levels, which the maps currently reflect.
- In District 4, we kept the Southeast cities united as many of the gateway cities as population would allow in a single district. We would have kept more of these cities in the same district; however, we were careful to avoid packing. In District 4, we kept the majority of the existing Southeast further west as the community of interest data indicated.

- District 5 retains the High Deserts as it compasses the Antelope Valley and the Santa Clarita Valley. It also includes a complete San Gabriel Valley, an area that was identified at the State level and was respected when they drew both the Assembly and Congressional maps. We also respect the community of interest for those who live in the Foothills and tried to keep Asian American working communities together in a single district. Additionally, in this district, we utilized the same architecture that we submitted with the CRC State Assembly draft which identifies the Voting Rights Act, Section 2-compliant Asian American opportunity district.
- We have a couple of suggestions. First, we are proud of the work we have done and would like it if you adopted our map as the base map to move from and to deviate from as you continue your deliberation process. Secondly, we want to suggest that you create a list of ranked criteria to help you navigate as you evaluate the plans and begin the drawing process. For example, at the State level with the CRC, “one person, one vote” and the Voting Rights Act are the top two criteria and they go on from there. We ask that you keep both of those factors at the top of your list, as well as including ethnic communities of interest and keeping unincorporated areas in the same district where possible, and of course respecting city and neighborhood lines where you can. Creating a filter of this kind will make your process more efficient and more relatable to the common public and everyday people.

Commissioner Hoffenblum asked what percentage of voters reside in the San Fernando Valley versus the city core and unincorporated cities to the South? He noted that Burbank was split.

Mr. Harris-Dawson did not know the answer to the question.

Commissioner Reyes asked if it was possible to compile and or summarize the information or testimony that was used or submitted to the CRC as the basis for drawing the map as it would be helpful information for us to have. In terms of districts that comply with the Voting Rights Act, from following the process from the CRC level, I know there are folks who are on the Redistricting Collaborative Team that include attorneys who have dealt with Voting Rights Acts issues. Have they reviewed this plan and given their perspective or any comments or conclusions on the Section 2 compliance aspect?

Mr. Harris-Dawson responded that a brief has not been submitted because they have been swamped with the State process but they have certainly looked at it and thought it made sense to submit and that there were no major red flags with it.

Commissioner Reyes made reference to working with an attorney during his time at MALDEF and requested that Mr. Harris-Dawson provide additional information as his schedule cleared up on the CRC level as it would be helpful.

Commissioner Hatanaka asked if race was not being used as the principal indicator, what was your strategy or assumptions made relative to the African American community. Many of us are interested in wanting to protect the integrity of districts. What were the assumptions used in trying to draw these particular boundaries.

Mr. Harris-Dawson responded, we made an assumption and had it confirmed by testimony that people who were in racial groups had other things in common and they outlined many of those things, such as access to employment, union memberships, density of seniors and host of other factors. We tried to make sure we kept a good record of those things, and after compiling those things, we were able to draw our lines. Clearly there are African Americans living all over the County that we don't include in the 2nd District but where we got testimony and where we were able to identify communities of interest, we did.

Commissioner Hatanaka asked with respect to his methodology about conducting focus groups, do you have that in a report or summary findings?

Mr. Harris-Dawson stated he could produce summaries from the community meetings.

Commissioner Hatanaka added that if it wasn't just about race but related characteristics, such as income, employment, and access to transportation, and there was a profile of data that you used to define communities of interest.

Mr. Harris-Dawson stated he could produce that and, in addition to the State Commission, we produced other maps that identified density of seniors, churches, and a lot of other factors that went into our formulation, and we can submit those to you as well.

Commissioner Acebo asked Ms. Takade of County Counsel how should all of the references to the State Commission be handled when we have never read, seen or heard any of the testimony.

Ms. Takade advised that the Committee can consider any relevant evidence and take what people say and weigh its significance. .

Commissioner Acebo stated that in regards to communities of interest, we have received both written and direct testimony in our public hearings and in other ways. You've talked about churches and unions and hillsides and how do you suggest we balance all that we've heard, what is your point of view?

Mr. Harris-Dawson responded that, in his opinion, almost any factor, including race, when you're talking about an individual, "one person one vote" is an abstraction. For example, I'm black, male, 3rd generation Angelino. There are many things you can say about any single individual, so what we tried to do is look for threads that people had in common and that matched geography. That was the best that we could do. Every single individual has a group of characteristics including race. What you find is that in specific areas there are correlations and you try to piece those together as best you can.

Commissioner Acebo stated we have received direct expressions for the record on communities of interest and I assume that we have to weigh those equally with your view of the world as well.

Mr. Harris-Dawson responded, I don't know that they have to be viewed equally I think some things are clearly more compelling than others and there are things that we want our society to organize more than others. So, for instance, if a community came forward and said, we are all millionaires and we should be kept together, that may not be as important as, we are in an areas that have a lot of fault lines and we worry about earthquakes.

Commissioner Acebo responded, I remember one letter from a city that wanted to remain intact, which is a direct expression of what they want and I think that kind of comment you have to weigh equally and represents a significant community of interest expression.

Mr. Harris-Dawson stated, we got testimony and feedback from cities that wanted to be kept together and very specific set of neighborhoods said they are more like the neighboring city than the remaining portion of their city. If they want to be in a district with another specific area, then the question becomes, why? Then folks can start to name things and that gives us the information we need to make the judgment call.

Commissioner Acebo stated in regards to the South L.A. communities, the historic core, it appears the preservation of that community was a high priority, is that true?

Mr. Harris-Dawson replied, yes it's true, that's where we started and it's where our organizations are headquartered. Working closely with various organizations, we were able to get information from other parts of the city, as well as when we host community meetings with African Americans from Altadena, West San Gabriel Valley, Long Beach and Lakewood and they give feedback. For the most potent part of our data, we go in South L.A. and the historic core but we also collected data beyond that.

Commissioner Acebo stated your plan has significant population shifts which cause significant changes in people's expressions and coalitions throughout the years. What were two or three factors why you felt it was important to have such a dramatic shift population?

Mr. Harris-Dawson responded, there are a lot of reasons but we are taking a hard look at the Voting Rights Act requirements and are looking really hard at the "one person, one vote" requirement. People move so that causes a population shift and there are changes in the demography of L.A. County and State and those are the things we tried to take into account in drawing the contours.

Commissioner Acebo stated, tell me some of the factors of the Section 2 District of the Voting Rights Act that you considered as you configured your lines.

Mr. Harris-Dawson responded, "one person, one vote" is important and where there are opportunity districts or the ability to draw opportunity districts for racial or language minorities, you want to try to do that to the extent that it makes sense, where you don't have to cut through cities or mountains or create odd looking shapes or non-compact shapes. You want to respect that as there has been so much community input. You are also able to overlay communities of interest data with that.

Commissioner Acebo asked when you drew this 2nd District, was that to preserve the African American community and is your 2nd District configuration a big factor in your math?

Mr. Harris-Dawson responded, it is a factor and while it is difficult to talk about that as being a leading factor, what you can talk about is preserving historical communities and communities of interest to the extent that is possible. Within the confines of our geography, we tried to do that.

Commissioner Martinez asked when you did your plan with MALDEF, did you take into account the Garza plan and did it allow you to think big?

Mr. Harris-Dawson responded that there is always a sensitivity towards Civil Rights and Voting Rights and our plan starts in that community when we looked at case law, there are times when we thought it could have been done better. Our map reflects that reality and view point. We didn't look at specifics but looked at what we thought could be corrected.

Commissioner Martinez asked, at any time did the City of Los Angeles say they want to stay in a Supervisory District. You have Long Beach split. We have had to make decisions to split these cities and I was wondering if you heard any feedback and why did you try to delineate unincorporated areas?

Mr. Harris-Dawson indicated he had received feedback from cities wanting to make sure they were in separate districts. County representation is important and is the last line of government before they get to the State Legislature, so giving unincorporated areas as much contiguity and compactness as we could was very important.

Chair Pedersen stated one of your goals was to create 50 plus percent Latino CVAP. Do you think if that was your goal, you could have drawn two such districts without such a high population reassignment?

Mr. Harris-Dawson responded that he could have drawn two Latino CVAP districts that had even higher CVAP numbers than what was submitted in the current plan, but since they looked at other factors besides race, they did not submit such a plan.

Commissioner Acebo stated in regards to traditional or historic voting rights issues, in present day, do you have any data concerning voting discrimination evidence in terms of voting patterns right now?

Mr. Harris-Dawson stated they have not conducted a racially polarized voting survey for any part of the County, but other folks may be working on that.

Commissioner Hoffenblum added it may be difficult to explain to residents in the Valley why they are included with downtown.

Mr. Harris-Dawson agreed it may be a difficult sell to Valley loyalists, but there are a lot of different types of people and we tried to take into account the contours of the communities in the valley that were vastly different.

Commissioner Reyes commented that having access to the polarized voting survey would be an asset to the Committee and it's important that we as a Committee should have that same study done with counsel's direction and special counsel's direction. Given the fact that we have seven plans proposing districts that raise the question in a strong way that there is a Section 2 issue on the table, we should have that information ourselves and not proceed without it. We will have further discussion about availability and guidance down the line.

Plan Q1 submitted by Steven Ochoa of MALDEF (Mexican American Legal Defense Fund) Submission 1:

Mr. Zimmerman read justifications C-G as set forth in the submitted plan.

He observed that the submittal was not a full redistricting plan as it accounts for only three supervisorial districts. He further noted that the plan did not use the County's Redistricting software or the County's Redistricting Data Units (RDUs), and therefore, staff was unable to conduct the full analysis as was done with other redistricting submittals.

Analysis of this submission was based on approximations of available data. While this cannot be considered as a full plan, it can be used as input and information for the Committee to consider in terms of a recommended plan.

The report submitted reflects three districts, labeled A, B, and C.

1. Total Population Deviation: (Page 20)

- A - 0.8 % off the ideal
- B - 1.0 % off the ideal
- C - 0.8 % off the ideal

2. In terms of total number of people moved, upwards of 4 million people are unassigned. Therefore, a countywide analysis could not be done. (Page 17)
3. Due to the submittal having only three districts, the Deferred and Advanced Voting analysis could not be done.
4. Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) was reported as follows:

Race/Ethnicity Categories
(Page 33 of the staff report on the plan.
No Benchmark comparisons were made)

	Hispanic Plan Q1	African American	Asian
District A	57.6 %	4.8 %	15.4 %
District B	51.7 %	6.5 %	12.0 %
District C	32.8 %	35.2 %	11.4 %

5. Incumbency
The plan places Supervisor Gloria Molina's residence in District B and Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas' residence in District C. The residences of Supervisors Zev Yaroslavsky, Don Knabe and Michael D. Antonovich are placed in unassigned areas of the County. The plan does not provide for an incumbent supervisor in District A.
6. Contiguity/Compactness
The three districts depicted appear to be contiguous and reasonably compact.
7. City/Community Splits or Unified
Due to the submittal having only three districts, an analysis could not be done.
8. Major Facilities Moved
Due to the submittal having only three districts, an analysis could not be done.

Mr. Zimmerman then provided his report on Plan R1 (MALDEF Submission 2), as submitted by Steven Ochoa:

Mr. Zimmerman read justifications C-G as set forth in the submitted plan.

Mr. Zimmerman observed that as with Plan Q1, R1 is also not a full redistricting plan as it accounts for only three supervisory districts. The plan does not use the County's Redistricting software or the County's RDUs, and therefore, staff was unable to do the full analysis as was done with other redistricting submittals. Analysis of this submission was based on approximations of available data. While this cannot be considered as a full plan, it can be used as input and information for the Committee to consider in terms of a recommended plan.

The report submitted reflects three district, labeled A, B, and C.

1. Total Population Deviation: (Page 20)
 - A - 1.2 % off the ideal
 - B - 0.3 % off the ideal
 - C - 0.7 % off the ideal
2. Total number of people moved analysis could not be done on a countywide basis. (Page 17)
3. Due to the submittal having only three districts, the Deferred and Advanced Voting analysis could not be done.
4. Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) was reported as follows:

Race/Ethnicity Categories
(Page 33 of the staff report on the plan.
No Benchmark comparisons were made)

	Hispanic Plan R1	African American	Asian
District A	56.8 %	4.8 %	15.6 %
District B	51.7 %	6.4 %	11.7 %
District C	33.2 %	35.4 %	10.8 %

5. Incumbency
The plan places Supervisor Gloria Molina's residence in District B and Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas' residence in District C. The residences of Supervisors Zev Yaroslavsky, Don Knabe and Michael D. Antonovich are placed in unassigned areas of the County. The plan does not provide for an incumbent supervisor in District A.

6. Contiguity/Compactness

The three districts depicted appear to be contiguous and reasonably compact.

7. City/Community Splits or Unified

Due to the submittal having only three districts, an analysis could not be done.

8. Major Facilities Moved

Due to the submittal having only three districts, an analysis could not be done.

Steven Ochoa, the National Redistricting Coordinator of MALDEF, gave an overview of the two submitted plans (Q1 and R1) with three districts each, which were intentionally unnumbered districts. The primary purpose was to offer options to this Committee which would create two Latino Section 2 mandated districts along with preserving an effective opportunity district for the African-American community. Together, MALDEF Districts A/B and MALDEF Districts C are easily interchangeable plans. The plans were drawn with reasonable deviations that could complement the "One Person, One Vote" rule in redistricting and are examples of districts that can be drawn consistent with Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. Both Districts A and B contain Latino populations that are sufficiently compact. These districts also contain areas with numerous examples of smaller jurisdictions at the federal and local levels that would allow Latinos to elect candidates of choice and show voter cohesion and effectiveness. Finally, great care was taken to put cities together in a manner that respects communities of interest in a reasonably compact space. In Plan Q1, only two cities would be split (Long Beach and Los Angeles). In Plan R1, the only additional city split would be Gardena. Overall, the plans submitted propose a significant improvement over the current Benchmark Plan while avoiding a minority disassociation. In closing, Mr. Ochoa explained that the reasoning in MALDEF choosing to submit plans with only three districts was to give the Committee flexibility in making decisions.

Commissioner Reyes - Referenced the San Fernando Valley area, and asked Mr. Ochoa for some examples of Latinos having the opportunity to elect candidates of their choice if given a chance or not having it in those areas that are split.

Mr. Ochoa – For the State Assembly, communities in the East San Fernando Valley have been kept whole and have had a chance to elect candidates of their choice for the last decade. Similarly, in the 1990s, communities were kept together resulting in Latinos electing candidates of their choice. The same dynamic has occurred within the Los Angeles City Council with respect to Council Districts 7 & 2. Conversely, this community was intentionally divided in the 2001 Redistricting at the Congressional level, resulting in communities not having an ability to select candidates of their choice at the Congressional level this decade. Also, throughout the 1990s, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) included the Valley with the Northeast portion of Los Angeles City, allowing Section 2 Districts to be drawn.

Commissioner Hoffenblum – Asked if Mr. Ochoa was aware of the period in 1981, when the argument of creating the first Latino District was brought before the Boundary Review Committee. A plan called the Hoffenblum plan was devised as a result of that which joined the Latino communities of the Valley and central city. During discussions with MALDEF and constituents that came and spoke to the Commission who live in the Valley, there was huge opposition from Latinos in the Valley who did not identify with Downtown. Why has MALDEF now, on the plans submitted, changed their views?

Mr. Ochoa stated it is not MALDEF that has changed its views. The population growth of the Latino community in the Valley has changed and grown.

Commissioner Hoffenblum – In the 2001 Congressional Redistricting, MALDEF went to court to fight the decision. He asked for Mr. Ochoa's opinion on why MALDEF lost their challenge.

Mr. Ochoa – A variety of reasons accounted for the loss. However, having not been in the mainstream of the litigation, he could not be specific on the legalities of the case. He did state that some of the key issues were the lack of transparency and exercise of executive privilege.

Commissioner Acebo – Did the courts substantiate and uphold the Congressional district as legal?

Mr. Ochoa – The courts validated the 2001 Redistricting plan and upheld it.

Commissioner Acebo – How do you substantiate that the Northeast San Fernando Valley has commonalities with Boyle Heights and the downtown Latino communities.

Mr. Ochoa – The maps submitted are made to be in compliance with the Constitution, the Federal Voting Rights Act and communities of interest to the extent practical. This plan results in a more compact shape for the County. It unites the eastern portion of the County into more compact configuration. It respects the Voting Rights Act, and the “One Person One Vote” perspective. MALDEF's maps balance both the Federal Voting Rights Act and communities of interest.

Commissioner Acebo – Referred back to MALDEF's written submissions of the three districts, which would create two Latino Section 2 districts and preserve the effective opportunity district for the African-American community. Was this the logic regarding Voting Rights Act compliance? What was Mr. Ochoa's focus? Does Mr. Ochoa think, within the current Benchmark lines, there are certain violations that exist right now to the Voting Rights Act?

Mr. Ochoa – Agreed with the logic and stated the focus of their submission is to comply with the law that needs to be applied now. Mr. Ochoa opined that if you used the current Benchmark plan, the plan would likely be in violation due to minority vote dilution because of packing issues. The current lines that were drawn 10 years ago were drawn to give voice to the Latino community in this County. Since then, the community has grown and the lines have to change in order to avoid further minority vote dilution. MALDEF's plans show examples that you can give a greater mandated voice to the community and are legally defensible plans.

Commissioner Acebo – Do you have any statewide commission testimony/expression that would have a direct relation to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors districts being drawn?

Mr. Ochoa – Stated he has not seen any official testimony submitted to the Statewide Commission relating to the County of Los Angeles or the Board of Supervisors. The bulk of the testimony provided by the public to the Statewide Commission before the Commission released its maps on June 10th, related to communities of interest.

Commissioner Harris –His experiences and Mr. Ochoa’s are similar to that of a lot of native Angelenos, in that, even if families move out of an area, those same families maintain an interest in the previous communities in which they resided.

Commissioner Harris asked if Mr. Ochoa had any empirical data showing movement of people from one area of the county to another.

Mr. Ochoa responded that perhaps Professor Leo Estrada would have that information.

Commissioner Martinez – Regarding the last Reapportionment Commission for LAUSD, and in response to Commissioner Acebo’s previous line of questioning regarding any connection between the Northeast portion of Los Angeles and the Downtown - East Los Angeles areas: The community at the time believed, even though there was a geographic separation, they were more connected economically, politically and socially with the Latino areas in Downtown, Boyle Heights and Southeast Los Angeles. They felt that connecting to the Northeast area would give a stronger voice for Latinos that would ultimately give them the ability to choose the person that would best represent the Latino community.

Commissioner Hoffenblum commented about where Torrance and Lawndale should be located in the South Bay. He is concerned that the districts as drawn by MALDEF appear racially gerrymandered, and inquired are these districts racial gerrymandering? He also inquired as to why MALDEF did not draw the other districts in, to account for 5 districts.

Mr. Ochoa – No, a racial gerrymandering is a district that is drawn solely with race as a consideration. MALDEF is presenting configurations where race is an element. These districts present commonalities shared like poverty, income, education, language, and logistical isolations.

Commissioner Reyes – Disagreed with Commissioner Hoffenblum’s assessment of racial gerrymandering in the MALDEF submitted plans. In his opinion, the plans satisfy the traditional redistricting criteria that have historically been taken into account in redistricting, including compactness. Additionally, the testimonies that have been presented today and previously included defensible arguments for the general district shapes presented.

Commissioner Reyes then asked if Mr. Ochoa had met with community members or conducted workshops within Los Angeles County and what were the outcomes of those workshops.

Mr. Ochoa – Attended multiple workshops within the State and spoke with communities of interest while they were performing their work on State Redistricting. He conducted at least six or seven workshops which included two in the San Fernando Valley. Mr. Ochoa will provide a narrative of some of the statements written by NALEO which would highlight some of the statements made during those workshops.

Chair Pedersen - Did you talk to any local officials? How would you view the opinions of the local elected officials?

Mr. Ochoa – We did not speak with elected officials. We focused more on the community network. I would view the inputs of the local elected officials with high regard, as these elected officials know their constituents and know what their constituents need.

Commissioner Acebo – With regard to direct testimony and letters speaking about the wishes of the communities of interest and where they would want to be, is it your opinion that the Committee needs to respect those requests along with other expressions of communities of interest? Would you equally weigh those opinions regarding State Redistricting with those of the County? How would you balance those expressions?

Mr. Ochoa – You can respect both the Voting Rights Act and communities of interest. The expressions relating to the State should complement those of the County. The expressions that relate to the State are additional sources. It will ultimately be the Committee's decisions to make the most well informed decision as possible.

Commissioner Hatanaka – Commented that the challenge is to also consider the 50% of the population that is not addressed in MALDEF plans. The Committee has received profound statements from the public in each of the supervisory districts. The current existing boundaries are inclusive of communities of interest.

Mr. Ochoa – commented that the Committee needs to comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act. This may conflict with some communities of interest.

Commissioner Acebo – Asked County Counsel, Nancy Takade if there is a "Mandate" for the Committee to draw two Section 2 districts. Are there any Section 2 Violations that the County is under?

Nancy Takade – There is no "Statutory Mandate," unless the facts show that certain conditions exist. This may be a difference in semantics. Violations have not yet been proven.

Commissioner Reyes commented that if the facts show that there is a Section 2 violation, then it is a "Mandate."

Commissioner Acebo – Restated his question: is any of the testimony presented to the Committee confirming that there are Section 2 Violations?

Commissioners Reyes and Harris referenced statements submitted by Alan Clayton and other public testimony that there are possible violations to the Voting Rights Acts that can be perceived as packing if they are permitted to continue.

Chair Pedersen provided his clarification to Mr. Ochoa's statement regarding "Mandate." The Committee is "mandated" to follow the Voting Rights Act. However, Mr. Ochoa's statement is that two Hispanic CVAP district populations are "Mandated." We do not know this yet. We are still reviewing plans.

Commissioner Napolitano – There are so many variables that can determine a Section 2 violation. Until it is determined by a court, we cannot assume that there is a violation.

Commissioner Ollague read-in commentary relating to the Garza case. She further commented that the Committee should do the due diligence and look at the socioeconomic data to determine if there is an issue.

George Abrahams - Member of the Beachwood Canyon Neighborhood Association – Opposed all submitted plans with the exception of Plan C1 submitted by John Purpura. It preserves their community of interests which is the Santa Monica Mountains. S1 and the MALDEF plans use their areas as a stepping stone. C1 is the most compact of all the plans. There is no need to racially gerrymander districts. The Hollywood sign area connects with the Hillside Federation within the Santa Monica Mountain range.

Cyndi Bendezu – Member of the Alliance on Better Communities read in a letter by her agency on their concerns over some of the map submissions for the Committee. She added there is an increase in population and yet they are not represented as fairly as needed. The MALDEF maps would more fairly represent her community.

Alan Clayton – Requested that the plan analysis be provided in color and further commented that S1 shows very minimal changes in the districts.

Attachments: [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - PLAN Q1](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary Q1](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - PLAN R1](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary R1](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - PLAN S1](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary S1](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT PLAN A1 - BENCHMARK](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary A1](#)

6. Presentation of summary of plans submitted by the public and discussion of approach for further review. (11-3083)

Mr. Zimmerman reported that the Summary of Proposed Plans Submitted by the Public was revised and provided to the Committee today. The summary includes all submitted plans that have been reviewed excluding the 16-district plan and the first plan submitted by Leo Estrada which was subsequently revised and re-submitted. The summary includes various data for each reviewed plan such as the number of RDUs, cities/communities moved, and Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP).

Ms. Takade reported that the document entitled “Boundary Review Committee’s Review and Consideration of Proposed Redistricting Plans,” is intended to provide the Committee with a summary of the factors and types of plans submitted and presented to the Committee at previous BRC meetings. The summary identifies the types of changes in the proposed plans and summarizes the salient factors. In addition, the guidelines categorize the plans as to whether there were minimal, large or extremely large changes.

Ms. Takade added that the document was reviewed by the Committee's outside counsel. The guidelines require that all plans must have five Supervisory Districts and recommend that the Committee consider all of the criteria set forth in the guidelines and select plans for further consideration based on a balancing of these criteria. Although there were request to do so, the guidelines do not rank the criteria in order of importance, as this should be done by the Committee at its discretion.

Commissioner Reyes indicated that some of the considerations listed in the Guidelines for Reviewing Proposals are not necessarily included in the Election Code Statutes such as: avoiding voter confusion, preserving core population of the districts. Commissioner Reyes stated that having clear ranked criteria would be helpful.

Chair Pedersen indicated that any additional criteria or changes to the Guidelines for Reviewing Proposals would require a motion by the Committee.

Commissioner Ollague suggested placing a revised list of criteria for discussion on the following BRC meeting agenda would be helpful.

Ms. Takade indicated that a discussion item will be placed on the BRC meeting agenda.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that during the next BRC meeting, if a Committee member wished to make changes to a submitted plan, it can be done in real time via the County's redistricting website.

Commissioner Reyes requested that outside counsel be prepared to present a review of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act compliance in reference to the criteria set forth in the Guidelines for Reviewing Proposals.

Ms. Takade stated that outside counsel is aware of the Committee's concerns and will be present to answer questions the Committee may have at its next meeting.

Alan Clayton, a member of the public, addressed the Committee and stated that he is pleased that the Summary of Proposed Plans Submitted by the Public was prepared because it is very helpful.

Attachments: [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Summary of Proposed Plans Submitted](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Guidelines for Reviewing Proposals](#)

III. FUTURE MEETINGS

7. Future dates for Boundary Review Committee meetings. (11-3059)

Mr. Zimmerman reported that the next BRC meeting is scheduled and confirmed for Wednesday July 6, 2011; however the following BRC meeting, which is scheduled for Monday July 11, 2011 has not yet been confirmed.

Chair Pedersen instructed staff to confirm Monday July 11, 2011 as a scheduled BRC meeting.

Attachments: [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Revised Proposed Boundary Review](#)

IV. MISCELLANEOUS

Matters Not Posted

8. Matters not on the posted agenda, to be discussed and (if requested) placed on the agenda for action at a future meeting of the Committee, or matters requiring immediate action because of an emergency situation or where the need to take action arose subsequent to the posting of the agenda. (11-3060)

No action was taken by the Committee.

Public Comment

9. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee on items of interest that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee. (11-3061)

Alan Clayton, a member of the public, addressed the Committee and stated the issue in 1990 stemmed from a lawsuit filed by the Department of Justice (DOJ) in 1988 based on “cracking,” where there were two 23 percent Spanish surname population levels in two districts when one district could have been created. When the boundary lines were redrawn, there was massive voter deferral which was at approximately 36 percent. When drawing boundary lines, the key is to consider various factors such as community interest and language. Mr. Clayton also considers partisan data when drawing lines.

Adjournment

10. Adjournment for the meeting of June 29, 2011. (11-3062)

The meeting adjourned at 5:16 p.m.